SJS 44 (Rev. (2/07, NJ 5/08)

## CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

|  | TOTAL COLORS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORMLY   |   |  |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| I. (a) PLAINTIFFS  |   | DEFENDANTS  |  |   |  |
| SANDRA W. WIL  | SON   | NCO FINANCIA  | NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC   |   |  |
| (b) County of Residence                                      | of First Listed Plaintiff   | County of Residence o                               | f First Listed Defendant   |   |  |
| (c) Attorney's (Firm Na                                      | me, Address, Telephone Number and Email Ad  | dress)  | CONDEMNATION CASES 119   | SE THE LOCATION OF THE                                  |  |
| Craig Thor Kimmel, E<br>Kimmel & Silverman,                  |   |   | NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. |   |  |
| 30 E. Butler Pike  |   | Attorneys (If Known)                                |  |   |  |
| Ambler, PA 19002   |   |   |  |   |  |
| (215) 540-8888   |   | <b>.</b>  |  |   |  |
| II. BASIS OF JURISI  | OICTION (Place on "X" in One Box Only)  | III. CITIZENSHIP OF P                               | RINCIPAL PARTIES   | Place on "X" in One Box for Plaintiff                   |  |
| □ 1 U.S. Government<br>Plaintiff                             | ☑ 3 Federal Question<br>(U.S. Government Not a Party)                             | (For Diversity Cases Only) P1 Citizen of This State |  |   |  |
| (I) 2 U.S. Government<br>Defendant                           | 🗗 4 Diversity   | Citizen of Another State (7                         |  |   |  |
| (Ætenban)  | (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)                                     |   | of Business In A   | Another State   |  |
|  |   | Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country            | 3 C 3 Foreign Nation   | 0606  |  |
| IV. NATURE OF SUI  | T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS  |   |  |   |  |
| O 110 Insurance  |   |   | BANKRUPTCY   | I: "'   |  |
| 120 Marine   | PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR  310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury                  |   | ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158<br>☐ 423 Withdrawal                              | 400 State Reapportionment     410 Antitrust             |  |
| ☐ 130 Miller Act   | O 315 Airplane Product Med, Malpraetic  | ce 625 Drug Related Seizure                         | 28 USC 157   | (1) 430 Banks and Banking                               |  |
| ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument<br>☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment | Liability © 365 Personal Injury  © 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liabilit          |   | PROPERTYRIGHTS   | U 450 Commerce U 460 Deportation                        |  |
| & Enforcement of Judgment                                    | Slander 🗇 368 Asbestos Person   |   | 820 Copyrights   | 55 460 Deportation 5 470 Racketeer Influenced and       |  |
| 151 Medicare Act     152 Recovery of Defaulted               | O 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product   | © 650 Airline Regs.                                 | C 830 Palent   | Corrupt Organizations                                   |  |
|  | Liability Liability  340 Marine PERSONAL PROPER                                   | RTY Safety/Health                                   | ☐ 840 Trademark  | 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV                    |  |
| (Exel, Veterans)   | 345 Marine Product 370 Other Fraud  | ☐ 690 Other   |  | ☐ 810 Selective Service                                 |  |
| ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment<br>of Veteran's Benefits       | Liability 0 371 Truth in Lending O 350 Motor Vehicle 0 380 Other Personal         | ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards                          | SOCIAL SECURITY  861 HIA (1395M)   | 850 Securities/Commodities/  Evolutions                 |  |
| ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits                                    | 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damas  |   | © 862 Black Lung (923)   | Exchange  875 Customer Challenge                        |  |
| ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability        | Product Liability 385 Property Damag  |   | ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))   | 12 USC 3410   |  |
| 196 Franchise  | So Other Personal Product Liability Injury  | / 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act         | ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI<br>☐ 865 RSI (405(g))                               | 890 Other Statutory Actions     891 Agricultural Acts   |  |
| REAL PROPERTY  | CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO   | ······································              | EEDERAL TAX SULTS  | 892 Economic Stabilization Act                          |  |
| 210 Land Condemnation     220 Foreclosure                    | ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vace ☐ 442 Employment Sentence                      | tic 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.  | O 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff<br>or Defendant)                             | 893 Environmental Matters     894 Energy Allocation Act |  |
| 🗇 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment                                 | ☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:   | Security Act  | 87) JRS—Third Perty  | O 895 Freedom of Information                            |  |
| 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability                 | Accommodations 530 General 535 Death Penalty                                      |   | 26 USC 7609  | Act   |  |
| 1 290 All Other Real Property                                | ☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Penalty ☐ 445 Amer, w/Disabilities - ☐ 540 Mandamus & O | IMMIGRATION  ther                                   | 1  | 900Appeal of Fee Determination     Under Equal Access   |  |
|  | Employment  | ☐ 463 Habeas Corpus -                               |  | to Justice  |  |
|  | 446 Amer, w/Disabilities - 555 Prison Condition<br>Other                          | Alien Detainee  465 Other Immigration               |  | 950 Constitutionality of     State Statutes             |  |
|  | ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights  | Actions   |  | State Statutes  |  |
| V ABIAN  |   |   |  |   |  |
| <b>33.1</b> Original   | ate Court Appellate Court   | Reopened anothe                                     | Cerred from G 6 Multidistrer district G Litigation                       | Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment       |  |
|  | Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you                                       | are filing (Do not cite jurisdiction:               | d statutes unless diversity):  |   |  |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTI  | ON Brief description of cause:<br>Fair Debt Collection Practices A                |   |  |   |  |
| VII. REQUESTED IN  |   | N DEMANDS   | CHECK YES only   | if demanded in complaint:                               |  |
| COMPLAINT:   | UNDER F.R.C.P. 23   |   | JURY DEMAND:   | Ø Yes □ No  |  |
| VIII. RELATED CAS  | E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE  |   | DOCKET NUMBER  |   |  |
| Explanation:   | -   | // m  |  |   |  |
| Winter   |   | ///   |  |   |  |
| DATE   | CIONI WHAT  | DEATEONARY OF THE COLUMN                            |  |   |  |
| WAY IN   | SIGNATURE   | PEATTORNEY OF RECORD                                |  |   |  |

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar. Address of Plaintiff: Address of Defendant: Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? NoC (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Clv.P. 7.1(a))  $N_0$ Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge Date Terminated: Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior sult pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes□ 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in sult or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously Yes□ No⊡ terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes 🗆 CIVIL: (Place ✔ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. O FELA Airplane Personal Injury □ Jones Act-Personal Injury □ Assault, Defamation 4. 

Antitrust □ Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Civil Rights 7. Products Liability 8. ☐ Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability --- Ashestos 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C. 1092 ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. Artomey-at-Law Attorney I.D.# NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by Jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (6/08)

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

## CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

| Sandra W   | v. Wilson       | :                    | CIVIL ACTION   |   |  |  |  |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| v.   |                 | :                    |  |   |  |  |  |
| VCO Financial  | Systems.Inc.    |                      | NO.  |   |  |  |  |
| In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned. |                 |                      |  |   |  |  |  |
| SELECT ONE OF TH   | E FOLLOWING CAS | E MANAGEM            | ENT TRACKS:  |   |  |  |  |
| a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.  |                 |                      |  |   |  |  |  |
| (b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.  |                 |                      |  |   |  |  |  |
| c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.  |                 |                      |  |   |  |  |  |
| (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.  |                 |                      |  |   |  |  |  |
| (e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are<br>commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by<br>the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special<br>management cases.)  |                 |                      |  |   |  |  |  |
| f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.  |                 |                      |  |   |  |  |  |
| 4/11/11<br>Date<br>215-540-8888  | Attorney-at-    | Kimme<br>Law<br>2804 | Sandra W. Wilson<br>Attorney for<br>Kimmel@creditlaw |   |  |  |  |
| Telephone  | FAX Number      | er                   | E-Mail Address                                       | , |  |  |  |
|  |                 |                      |  |   |  |  |  |

(Civ. 660) 10/02

#### 1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 2 3 SANDRA W. WILSON, 4 Plaintiff 5 ٧. Case No.: 6 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR 7 **JURY TRIAL** Defendant 8 (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 **COMPLAINT** 10 SANDRA W. WILSON ("Plaintiff"), by and through her attorneys, KIMMEL & 11 SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. 12 ("Defendant"): 13 14 INTRODUCTION 15 1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 16 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"). 17 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 18 2, Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states 19 that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court 20 without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original 21 jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States. 22 3. Defendant conducts business and has an office in the Commonwealth of 23 Pennsylvania and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established. 24 Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1). 4. 25 5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

#### **PARTIES**

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in White City, Oregon, 97503.
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road in Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

  See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.
- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt

collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

#### FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 15. At all relevant times, Defendant was attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt from Plaintiff on a Capital One credit card account.
- 16. The alleged debt at issue arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.

- 17. Beginning in or around June of 2009 and continuing through June 2010, Defendant made continuous and repeated calls to Plaintiff's cellular and work telephone numbers in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 18. On a number of occasions, Plaintiff received phone calls and voicemail messages from Defendant from the following phone number: (215) 441-3000, which the undersigned has confirmed belongs to Defendant.
- 19. Defendant placed repeated calls to Plaintiff's telephone almost every day causing Plaintiff to receive, at times, more than two (2) collection calls a day and at times, more than four (4) collection calls a day.
  - 20. Defendant claimed that Plaintiff owed \$1,615.14.
  - 21. Plaintiff disputes owing \$1,615.14.
- 22. To the best of Plaintiff's recollection, any debt that she may have owed to Capital One was less than \$700.00 only ten (10) months earlier.
- 23. Plaintiff informed Defendant that she was working with a debt settlement program and asked if she could arrange to make payments through the program.
- 24. Defendant told Plaintiff that it would not accept any payments through a debt settlement program; rather, Defendant claimed that her only option was to settle the debt with them.
- 25. Defendant claimed to Plaintiff that Defendant would conduct an asset search, and any property she owned would be taken to satisfy the debt if she did not make payments.
- 26. At times when speaking with Defendant's representatives, Plaintiff would be cut off, and the representatives would yell at her, which Plaintiff felt was abusive conduct.
  - 27. Defendant has threatened to report this alleged debt to the credit reporting

bureaus.

28. In April 2010, Defendant told Plaintiff that legal action would be taken against her if she did not pay the alleged debt.

- 29. Further, in response to Defendant's repetitive phone calls to her place of employment, Plaintiff sent Defendant several cease and desist letters, in addition to verbally demanding, that Defendant stop contacting her at her place of employment.
- 30. Despite Plaintiff's requests, Defendant continued to call Plaintiff at her place of employment.
- 31. Most recently, on May 10, 2010, May 11, 2010, and May 12, 2010, Defendant contacted Plaintiff's co-workers in search of Plaintiff, informing Plaintiff's co-workers that the call was in regards to a personal matter Defendant had with Plaintiff.
- 32. Plaintiff's boss has even verbally informed Defendant that Plaintiff was not allowed to receive personal calls at work.
- 33. Ultimately, in order to stop Defendant's continuous and repeated calls, Plaintiff changed her cellular telephone number.
- 34. To date, despite its threats to do so, Defendant has not filed a lawsuit or taken other legal action against Plaintiff; thereby, indicating that Defendant never had the intent to take legal action against Plaintiff.
- 35. Defendant's actions in attempting to collect the alleged debt were harassing, abusive and highly deceptive.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

36. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer

 need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." Russell v. Equifax A.R.S., 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).

- 37. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).
- 38. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

2

3

5

7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

# COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 39. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
  - a. Defendant violated of the FDCPA generally;
  - b. Defendant violated §1692b(2) of the FDCPA by stating the Plaintiff owed a
    debt to another person, specifically her co-workers;
  - c. Defendant violated §1692b(3) of the FDCPA by communicating with Plaintiff's co-workers more than once about a debt alleged to be owed by Plaintiff;
  - d. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(3) of the FDCPA when it contacted the Plaintiff at her place of employment after Defendant knows or has reason to know that Plaintiff's employer prohibits Plaintiff from receiving such communication;
  - e. Defendant violated §1692c(b) of the FDCPA by communicating with Plaintiff's co-workers about a debt alleged to be owed by Plaintiff without Plaintiff's prior consent;
  - f. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff in connection with the collection of an alleged debt;
  - g. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused the Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;
  - h. Defendant violated §1692e of the FDCPA by using false, deceptive, or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of a

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

debt;

- i. Defendant violated §1692e(4) of the FDCPA by threatening or implicating that nonpayment of any debt will result in the seizure or sale of any property of any person when such action was not lawful and Defendant did not intend to take such action;
- j. Defendant violated §1692e(5) of the FDCPA by threatening to take action that cannot legally be taken or that is not intended to be taken;
- k. Defendant violated §1692e(10) of the FDCPA by using false representations
  or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- m. Defendant violated §1692f(1) of the FDCPA by collecting any amount including any interest, fee, charge, or expense incidental to the principle obligation unless such amount is expressly authorized by the agreement creating the debt or permitted by law; and
- n. Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, SANDRA W. WILSON, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);

- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

#### DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, SANDRA W. WILSON, demands a jury trial in this case.

DATED: 4/11/1

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

By:

Craig Thor Kimmel
Attorney ID # 57100
Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.
30 E. Butler Pike

Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com